

# Supplementary Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 2023

Please note that the attached supplementary information was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

<b>Agenda No</b>	<b>Item</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes</b>	<b>1 - 2</b>
	To receive the minutes of the last meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party.	
<b>5(a)</b>	<b>APP/21/01071 - Land south of, Lower Road, and west of Old Manor Farm, Havant</b>	<b>3 - 6</b>
	APP/21/01071 - Land south of, Lower Road, and west of Old Manor Farm, Havant	
	Proposal: Outline planning application for up to 43 dwellings, with access from Lower Road and associated landscaping, open space and allotments, and all other matters reserved.	

[Additional Documents](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

## HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 16 February 2023

Present

Councillor: Crellin (Chairman)

Councillors: Linger and Weeks

Other Councillor: Fairhurst  
Councillors

Officers: Mark Gregory, Democratic Services Officer  
Steve Weaver, Development Manager  
Ernest Lam, Democratic Services Officer

### 22 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bowdell, Milne, Scannell and Richardson.

### 23 Minutes

Resolved that the minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 5 January 2023 be approved as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

### 24 Declarations of Interests

Councillor Fairhurst declared that she had come to a conclusive view on application APP/21/01071 and would not be attending the Planning Committee to be held on 23 February 2023 as a member.

She attended this meeting in her capacity as a ward member and only focused only on site factors and site issues.

#### 24a APP/21/01071 - Land south of, Lower Road, and west of Old Manor Farm, Havant

Proposal: Outline planning application for up to 43 dwellings, with access from Lower Road and associated landscaping, open space and allotments, and all other matters reserved.

The site was viewed at the request of the Executive Head of Place.

The Working Party received a report by the Executive Head of Place.

The Working Party viewed the site, the subject of the application, from Lower Road, Bedhampton and the footpath running alongside the north and west of the site to assess whether there were any additional matters that should be considered by the Planning Committee.

RESOLVED that, based on the site inspection and information available at the time, the following additional information be provided to the Planning Committee:

- (a) The distance of the development from the A27 to the railway.

**The meeting commenced at 1.30 pm and concluded at 2.26 pm**

.....  
**Chairman**

## **Deputation from Bedhampton Heritage Alliance (BHA) re APP/21/01071.**

BHA appreciate the comprehensive officers' report and support refusal of the application. Nevertheless, there are outstanding concerns that together cumulatively tip the "Planning Balance" suggesting additional reasons for refusal.

The failure to follow recommendations for a full application adjacent to the Conservation Area means that **guesswork** is needed to determine how, and if, the application delivers **quality placemaking**.

Confusion exists whether the layout will have a rural or urban character. On the initial entry road, the illustration shows continuous double bay parking spaces on the forecourts either side and no pavements ...a very hostile urban character for pedestrians.

The Conservation Officer considers the harm to heritage is "*less than substantial*". Whilst there is no direct harm to the Conservation Area itself, entry from Phase 1 drives through the approved buffer zone which forms part of the Phase 1 mitigation measures to protect the Conservation Area from harm. This exposure, together with the loss of the remainder of the rural setting to the west, without any mitigation, means the harm to heritage assets is **significant**.

House types are not yet known. Phase 1 demonstrates a range of gimmicky architecture including false chimneys, buttresses, and infill brick panels. BHA believe Bedhampton does not want more of the same placemaking?

More current significant unknowns include that the proposal does not meet the SPD requirement for visitor parking and the drainage and flood protection solution(s) which may require on site storage. The provision for both these elements may reduce the area available for houses.

The conclusion **must** be that...

The applicant has **failed to demonstrate** that the size of the development proposed (43 dwellings) can be satisfactorily accommodated at the site in a high-quality design without harm to the heritage assets and the amenities and environment of the area. This should form **a further reason for refusal**.

BHA continue to have concerns regarding safety on the blind bends of Lower Road. In particular, the applicant's misleading claim that these have "*an impeccable safety record*". Residents have years of experiencing regular encounters and near misses that are **not** recorded. Safe passage during construction is currently dependant on the presence of a banksman.

The approval of Phase 1 was based upon a mistaken analysis. The applicant's risk assessment was based upon probabilities that were wrongly combined to produce a statistically incorrect result. They claimed that two opposing vehicles will arrive at the same place (the narrow unpaved section within the middle of the bends) and time as a non-vehicular user is there once every 56,000 times the user passes along this section.

Members of Bath University confirmed this is based upon a statistical error (multiplying 3 probabilities together). By modelling the applicant's Phase 1 data, they showed this situation could occur **every other day!**

This finding was shared at the time but ignored by the parties concerned.

BHA believe this frequency clearly reinforces their safety concerns **and** provides a better appreciation of the detrimental impact upon amenity within the Conservation Area. This proposal will result in even more additional movements around the bends and through the heart of the Conservation Area adding to the harm.

Together these provide a measure of how much **more weight** should be attached to these impacts in the Planning Balance.

This aspect should be the subject of an additional **reason for refusal** or be added to the previous issues where *the cumulative impact of harms will not be outweighed by any benefits arising from the development.*

**Deputation on behalf of Havant Climate Alliance and Havant Friends of the Earth to HBC Planning Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2023  
re. App/21/01071 for 43 homes south of Lower Road, Bedhampton**

**We object to this outline application. While it is understood to be under Appeal, we support the position advised, i.e. that had an Appeal not been lodged, the Committee should refuse planning permission.**

**Ecology**

This was a secondary support site for Brent Geese and Waders. Following 4 years of bird surveys none of these birds have been seen on the site, not surprising considering the disturbance caused by construction work. However it has now been completely dismissed as a support site for the birds. Land adjacent or close to Langstone Harbour plays an important role in supporting Brent Geese and Waders, but over time many such sites are being lost to building, with a cumulative effect. It is increasingly important that any unbuilt land close to the harbour should be protected as “candidate sites” which could be used in future for the birds, irrespective of their current agricultural management or whether the birds are currently using them.

It is noted that a site wide ecological mitigation strategy is needed.

More positively, no trees are to be cut down and landscaping is good with proposed planting of native trees and shrubs. There should be additional planting to provide a buffer zone around the south and west of the site. There should be attention to wildlife corridors, bird and bat boxes and swift bricks.

**Flood risk**

It is reported that the site cannot be satisfactorily drained.

**Loss of more BMV land.**

Post Brexit our food security has become more important i.e. this Category 3a, 3b and 2 land should be left in agricultural use.

**Loss of Heritage and Landscape.**

It has been commented that the additional housing will further destroy the rural feel of this location, making it more urban.

**Noise from A27, railway and link road.**

The Accoustic Assessment estimated that about one third of dwellings would need to rely on closed windows and alternative ventilation. This is not acceptable especially in summer.

**Air Quality and Carbon Reduction**

These homes will already be subject to a considerable level of air pollution because of their closeness to the A27 and roundabouts and link roads. It is noted that additional pollution could be prevented by measures such as encouraging active travel and planting urban trees known to improve air quality.

However the greatest benefits would come from designing these homes to be as close to net zero as possible. There is a long list of measures such as electric space heating and cooking, waste water heat recovery, and use of solar PV. However it then recommends that only a few homes should be exemplars of zero carbon with solar PV, batteries and EV charge points. For maximum benefit surely these standards should be applied to all the

homes. Where electric heating is being considered, heat pumps use the least electricity. Ground source heat pumps, which are more efficient than Air source, are more easily installed during construction and can also deliver cooling in summer. Perhaps a communal heating scheme could be considered.

### **Road Safety.**

Despite planned improvements, the upper end of Lower Road with its narrow double blind bend remains a risk. To say that it is not because there have been no accidents there in the last 20 years is meaningless, given the very low numbers of people living there previously. The planning decision for 43 homes should be delayed until all 50 new homes are occupied, after which road usage can be better assessed. Although there are references to cyclists and pedestrians accessing the walking/cycle route to the north west of the site, I suggest that the majority may prefer to follow a “desire line” eastwards taking them towards Bedhampton schools, the local shops, bus stops and Havant. This desire line will take them through the double blind bend, increasing risks as numbers of all types of road users increase. I suggest that this alone is sufficient reason not to permit 43 more homes in Lower Road.

Pat Brooks